



BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) for a certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Concerning the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (Segments 4 through 11)

Application 07-06-031

### **PROTEST OF THE DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES**

Pursuant to Rule 2.6 of the Commissions' Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Division of Ratepayer Advocates ("DRA") hereby files its protest on Southern California Edison Company's (SCE) Application for a certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Concerning the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (TRTP) Segments 4 through 11.

SCE filed the Application on June 29, 2007. The Application was calendared on July 3, 2007. Therefore, DRA's protest is timely. The Application seeks Commission approval to construct "a series of new and upgraded high-voltage transmission lines and substation facilities that will allow generating resources, consisting primarily of wind generation, that are planning to locate in the Tehachapi and Big Creek Corridor areas to deliver electricity from new wind farms in eastern Kern County, California, to the Los Angeles Basin." (SCE's Application, p. 1.)

TRTP is expected to add between 700 megawatts ("MW") to 4500 megawatts ("MW") of new renewable resources to the California Independent System Operator<sup>1</sup>-

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereinafter "CAISO".

controlled grid, enabling California utilities to meet the goals set in the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) program (SB 1078<sup>[2]</sup>).

## **I. POTENTIAL ISSUES**

Preliminarily, “SCE requests that the Commission explicitly establish that, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code §399.25, SCE can recover through CPUC-jurisdictional rates all prudently incurred costs associated with TRTP incurred by SCE that the [Federal Energy Regulatory Commission] FERC does not allow SCE to recover in general transmission rates<sup>[3]</sup>.”

DRA is currently reviewing the TRTP application and supporting papers. Further, DRA expects to conduct discovery and evaluate the costs necessary and reasonable for the construction of TRTP. Therefore, DRA protests SCE’s requests for approval of costs that FERC does not allow, until DRA’s review and discovery are complete and the information available to DRA is sufficient to support such a condition.

Further, DRA expects the following cost elements might be additional issues:

(1) The scope of TRTP to the extent that the magnitude and route of the expected line may result in extensive cancellations or abandonment by the new developments that are expected to tie-in to the facility.

(2) SCE’s route selection, environmental impact report, projected schedule and right-of-way acquisitions, and their impact on the cost effectiveness of the project SCE has presented for approval.

## **II. CATEGORIZATION**

DRA agrees with SCE that this proceeding should be in the ratesetting category.

---

<sup>2</sup> Pub. Util. Code §399.11 et. seq.

<sup>3</sup> “Specifically, SCE’s Transmission Revenue Requirement (“TRR”) and the California ISO’s (“CAISO’s”) Transmission Access Charge (“TAC”).

### **III. HEARINGS AND SCHEDULE**

DRA requests that the Commission schedule a hearing because of the importance of TRTP and the extent to which its construction might affect various communities around the state. However, DRA cannot now recommend a schedule or support SCE's schedule before the Energy Division (ED) begins the Environmental Impact Review (EIR).

However, DRA supports SCE's requests for a Pre-Hearing Conference in March 2008, at which time ED would have had a chance to consider the EIR. DRA will be prepared to discuss parties' suggestions for different schedules at the PHC.

DRA appreciates the opportunity to perform the review, discovery and analyses necessary to fairly evaluate this application.

### **IV. CONCLUSION**

For all the reasons stated above, DRA respectfully requests the Commission accept its recommendations for TRTP.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ NOEL OBIORA

---

Noel Obiora  
Staff Counsel

Attorney for the Office of Ratepayer Advocates

California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Phone: (415) 703-5987  
Fax: (415) 703-2262

August 2, 2007

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of “**PROTEST OF DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES**” in **A.07-06-031** by using the following service:

☒ **E-Mail Service:** sending the entire document as an attachment to all known parties of record who provided electronic mail addresses.

☐ **U.S. Mail Service:** mailing by first-class mail with postage prepaid to all known parties of record who did not provide electronic mail addresses.

Executed in San Francisco, California, on the **2nd** day of **August, 2007**.

/s/ REBECCA ROJO

---

Rebecca Rojo

## **N O T I C E**

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address and/or e-mail address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Service list**  
**A.07-06-031**

Guiou4@aol.com;  
KMSn@pge.com;  
SxZc@pge.com;  
albertchan92845@yahoo.com;  
asteele@hanmor.com;  
claufenb@energy.state.ca.us;  
danhaste@yahoo.com;  
jgenis3833@aol.com;  
jprindiville@pachorizon.com;  
jshortl@aqmd.gov;  
judi.tamasi@mrca.ca.gov;  
julie.miller@sce.com;  
lbouwer@roadrunner.com;  
mdemian@technip.com;  
nrader@calwea.org;  
rldees@attglobal.net;